

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

RICHARD CASTILLO,  
*Plaintiff*

v.

HARRIS COUNTY,  
CONSTABLE PCT. 6,  
*Defendant*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CA \_\_\_\_\_

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT**

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW Plaintiff Richard Castillo (“Plaintiff” or “Castillo”) complaining of Harris County, Constable Pct. 6 (“CP6”), and for cause would show the following:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff is a fully certified Texas Peace Officer and resides in Harris County, Texas.
2. CP6 is a political department of Harris County administered by policymaker and elected official Silvia Trevino (“ST”), and is a police agency in Harris County, Texas.

## **JURISDICTION**

1. Plaintiff timely filed his Charge of Discrimination, 460-2020 - 04004, and received his EEOC Right to Sue on March 31, 2021; Plaintiff files this his federal Title VII and Title 42, USC §1981 Complaint within 90 days of the date of his receipt of his Right to Sue Letter.

## **FACTS**

2. Plaintiff is a Hispanic male, and was an officer at CP6 who opposed discriminatory employment practices and arbitrary violation of entity policies by Defendant, and until he was terminated and thereafter given a General Discharge based on false and arbitrary facts, was a certified Peace Officer in good standing in the State of Texas.
3. Plaintiff adopts his EEOC Charge of Discrimination and incorporates herein.
4. Plaintiff opposed racially discriminatory employment practices by Defendant treating African American applicants and employees less favorably than Hispanic's or Whites.
5. Plaintiff also noted that Defendant violated or failed to comply without explanation entity rules, as exemplified by the following:
  - a. FAILURE TO PROVIDE 24 HOUR NOTICE OF INVESTIGATION DURING THE FIRST PHASE OF INVESTIGATION;

- b. AFTER COMPLETING ONE SMALL INVESTIGATION INTERNAL AFFAIRS IMMEDIATELY ADVISED CAPTAIN CASTILLO THERE IS ANOTHER PENDING INVESTIGATION ON HIM.
- c. DEFENDANT (“THEY”) FAILED TO ADVISE PLAINTIFF HE WAS UNDER INVESTIGATION
- e. DURING THE WRITTEN STATEMENT CASTILLO WAS COERCED TO GIVE STATEMENT WITHOUT SEEKING LEGAL COUNSEL;
- f. THEY DID NOT PROVIDE CAPTAIN CASTILLO AMPLE TIME TO SEEK LEGAL ADVICE;
- g. THEY WERE UNTRUTHFUL ABOUT COMPLAINTS FROM DEPUTIES
- h. THEY FAILED TO OVERALL PROVIDE CASTILLO WITH ANY INFORMATION THAT WOULD NOTIFY HIM TO HE WAS BREAKING POLICY;
- i. THEY NEVER ADVISED CASTILLO THE RIGHT TO CONFRONT THE ACCUSER NOR DID THEY EVER ATTEMPT TO SETTLE THIS MATTER VIA MEDIATION;
- j. BEFORE CASTILLO WAS TERMINATED PCT.6 FAILED TO ADVISE ON WHAT GROUNDS WAS CASTILLO TERMINATED
- k. IT WAS NOT TILL 7 DAYS LATER BY LAW TCOLE MANDATED PCT 6 TO GIVE A REASON FOR TERMINATION.

### **CAUSES OF ACTION**

6. Defendant retaliated against Castillo because he opposed discriminatory employment practices in violation of Title VII.

7. Defendant denied Castillo substantive and procedural due process rights and deprived him of a career in public law enforcement .

8. But for Defendant's violation of Title VII, and or the Fourteenth Amendment, Castillo would not have been terminated.

9. Defendants illegal conduct has proximately caused Castillo to suffer damages.

### **PRAYER**

Plaintiff prays that upon trial hereof before a jury of her peers, whereupon , she be awarded judgment for damages, economic and non-economic, and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees and costs of court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Larry Watts

Watts & Company Lawyers, LTD

Larry Watts SBN 20981000

FED Id 7092

*Counsel for Plaintiff, Richard Castillo*

